

# Dialogue Discourse-Aware Graph Convolutional Networks for Abstractive Meeting Summarization

Xiachong Feng, Xiaocheng Feng, Bing Qin, Xinwei Geng, Ting Liu

Research Center for Social Computing and Information Retrieval,

Harbin Institute of Technology, China

{xiachongfeng, xcfeng, qinb, xwgeng, tliu}@ir.hit.edu.cn

## Abstract

Sequence-to-sequence methods have achieved promising results for textual abstractive meeting summarization. Different from documents like news and scientific papers, a meeting is naturally full of dialogue-specific structural information. However, previous works model a meeting in a sequential manner, while ignoring the rich structural information. In this paper, we develop a Dialogue Discourse-Aware Graph Convolutional Networks (DDA-GCN) for meeting summarization by utilizing dialogue discourse, which is a dialogue-specific structure that can provide pre-defined semantic relationships between each utterance. We first transform the entire meeting text with dialogue discourse relations into a discourse graph and then use DDA-GCN to encode the semantic representation of the graph. Finally, we employ a Recurrent Neural Network to generate the summary. In addition, we utilize the question-answer discourse relation to construct a pseudo-summarization corpus, which can be used to pre-train our model. Experimental results on the AMI dataset show that our model outperforms various baselines and can achieve state-of-the-art performance.

## 1 Introduction

Automatic summarization is a fundamental task in natural language generation and computational linguistics. It is crucial to help the user quickly read and understand daily events, and has been continuously studied for decades. (Paice, 1990; Kupiec et al., 1999). In this paper, we focus on meeting summarization, which is an extensively studied task in the field of automatic summarization. Given multiple speakers and corresponding utterances in text, the task calls for generating a shorter transcript, covering salient information of the entire meeting.




Figure 1: (a) An example of meeting with its corresponding summary, where “ID” is short for Industrial Designer, “UI” for User Interface, “PM” for Project Manager. (b) Summary generated by Sentence-Gated (Goo and Chen, 2018) which models utterances sequentially. (c) Summary generated by our DDA-GCN which models utterances by incorporating dialogue discourse.

An example is shown in Figure 1, which includes 3 speakers and their utterances  $U_1, U_2, U_3$ , and  $U_4$ , as well as a human-written summary.

Meeting summarization is typically regarded as a kind of abstractive summarization problem in the literature. The majority of existing studies build summarization systems based on the sequence-to-sequence model, which adopts a sequence modeling strategy for encoding utterances (Goo and Chen, 2018; Ganesh and Dingliwal, 2019; Liu et al., 2019a,b; Li et al., 2019a; Zhu et al., 2020). Despite

the effectiveness of these approaches, they typically only use sequential text information while ignoring the important influences of dialogue structure. We claim that dialogue-specific structural information is important for meeting summarization. For example, dialogue discourse is an effective structural feature. As shown in Figure 1(c), “Contrast”, “Question-Answer” and “Continuation” are three dialogue discourse relations, which can provide more precise semantic relationships between each utterance. Specifically, we can see that the existing sequence modeling method is unable to generate correct summary results (shown in Figure 1(b)), which can be attributed to the system not knowing the  $U_3$  and  $U_4$  are opposed to the  $U_1$ ’s proposal. Differently, the dialogue discourse can provide this key information via labeling the “Contrast” relationship, as shown in Figure 1(c). Accordingly, how to effectively integrate the discourse relationship into the existing summarization model become a crucial step in meeting summarization.

In this paper, we propose Dialogue Discourse-Aware Graph Convolutional Networks (DDA-GCN) to address this problem. In detail, we first convert the entire meeting with dialogue discourse labeling into a discourse graph, which represents both utterances and discourse relationships as vertices. Afterwards, we additionally design six types of directed edges and one global vertex in the discourse graph to facilitate information flow. Finally, we employ a graph convolutional network (Schlichtkrull et al., 2018) to encode the graph and pass the semantic representation to the RNN decoder. Besides, we further use the question-answer discourse relationship to construct a pseudo-summarization corpus for pre-training DDA-GCN. In a conversation, a question often sparks a discussion, so naturally, the question can be used as a pseudo-summary for subsequent discussions.

We conduct experiments on the widely used AMI benchmark (Carletta et al., 2005). Our approach outperforms various baselines. Moreover, we analyze the effectiveness of dialogue discourse and pseudo-summarization corpus. In the end, we give a brief summary of our contributions: (1) To the best of our knowledge, we are the first to apply dialogue discourse to model the structure of a meeting for meeting summarization; (2) We design a discourse-aware graph model to encode the entire meeting; (3) Our model achieves a new SOTA on the AMI dataset.




Figure 2: Levi Graph Transformation

## 2 Background

In this section, we first describe the task definition for meeting summarization, then give a brief introduction to dialogue discourse and Levi graph.

### 2.1 Task Definition

Meeting summarization task aims at producing a summary  $Y$  for the input meeting  $U$ , where  $U$  consists of  $|U|$  utterances  $[u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{|U|}]$  and  $Y$  consists of  $|Y|$  words  $[y_1, y_2, \dots, y_{|Y|}]$ . The  $i$ -th utterance of the meeting can be represented as a sequence of words  $u_i = [u_{i,1}, u_{i,2}, \dots, u_{i,|u_i|}]$ , where  $u_{i,j}$  denotes the  $j$ -th word of  $i$ -th utterance. Each utterance  $u_i$  associates with a speaker  $p_i \in P$ ,  $P$  being a set of participants.

### 2.2 Dialogue Discourse

Dialogue discourse indicates relations between discourse units in a conversation (utterances in a meeting). Different from constituency-based discourse structures, such as Rhetorical Structure Theory (RST) (Mann and Thompson, 1988), this dependency-based structure allows relations between non-adjacent utterances which is applicable for multi-party conversions. There are 16 discourse relations in total: *comment, clarification-question, elaboration, acknowledgment, continuation, explanation, conditional, question-answer, alternation, question-elaboration, result, background, narration, correction, parallel* and *contrast*.

### 2.3 Levi Graph

A graph can be transformed into the Levi graph (Levi, 1942; Gross et al., 2013) by turning labeled edges into additional vertices. Let  $G = (V, E, R)$  denote a directed graph, the corresponding Levi graph is defined as  $G_L = (V_L, E_L, R_L)$ , where  $V_L = V \cup E$ . In order to facilitate information flow over the graph, previous works (Marcheggiani and Titov, 2017; Beck et al., 2018) define three types of edges  $R_L = \{default, reverse, self\}$  which refer to the original forward direction, new reverse direction and self-loop direction separately. With this approach, we can encode utterances and relations in the same way. An example is shown in Figure 2.




Figure 3: Illustration of discourse graph.

### 3 Discourse Graph Construction

In this section, we first give the notation for discourse graph and then describe the details of our discourse graph construction process. An example of discourse graph is shown in Figure 3(e).

#### 3.1 Notation

Let  $G_D = (V_D, E_D, R_D)$  denote a discourse graph, with vertices  $v_i \in V_D$  and labeled edges  $(v_i, r, v_j) \in E_D$ , where  $r \in R_D$  is the relation type of the edge.

#### 3.2 Discourse Graph

Given a meeting and its corresponding dialogue discourse, we construct discourse graph based on the Levi graph transformation described in section 2.3. We now have two types of vertices including utterance vertices and edge vertices. For example, an edge  $(U_3, \text{Continuation}, U_1)$  in the original graph becomes  $(U_3, \text{default}, \text{Continuation})$  and  $(\text{Continuation}, \text{default}, U_1)$  in the Levi graph. Note that different types of vertices may have different features which fall in different space (Beck et al., 2018). Specifically, previous works ignore the type of source and target vertices and use the same type of edge to pass information, such as *default*, which may reduce the effectiveness of discourse information. To this end, we propose our discourse graph which transforms the *default* edge into *default-in-discourse* and *default-out-discourse* edges (shown in Figure 3(b)) and the *reverse* edges into *reverse-in-discourse* and *reverse-out-discourse* edges (shown in Figure 3(c)). Furthermore, to aggregate non-local information, a global vertex is added which connects all vertices by *global* edges and will be used to initialize the decoder (shown in Figure 3(d)). Finally, there are six types of relations, where  $R_D$  be-

comes *default-in-discourse*, *default-out-discourse*, *reverse-in-discourse*, *reverse-out-discourse*, *global*, *self*.

### 4 Dialogue Discourse-Aware Graph Convolutional Networks

In this section, we describe the details of our Dialogue Discourse-Aware Graph Convolutional Networks (DDA-GCN) which consists of three components: an utterance encoder, a graph encoder, and a pointer decoder. The model is shown in Figure 4.

#### 4.1 Vertex Representation

For global vertex and relation vertices, we obtain the initial representation  $h_i^0$  by looking up from an embedding table. For utterance vertices, we employ a BiLSTM as the utterance encoder, which updates its hidden state upon each received word sequentially. As  $h_{i,j} = BiLSTM(h_{i,j-1}, e_{i,j})$ , where  $h_{i,j}$  and  $e_{i,j}$  denote the hidden state and the embedding of word  $u_{i,j}$  respectively. In a multi-party conversation, the speaker additionally plays an important part, so we encode speaker  $p_i$  using a one-hot vector and get  $e_{i,j}$  by concatenating the corresponding word embedding and one-hot speaker embedding. The concatenation of the forward and backward final hidden states in the utterance encoder indicated as the representation  $h_i^0$ , which is used as input to the graph encoder.

#### 4.2 Graph Encoder

After getting the initial feature  $h_i^0$  of each vertex  $v_i \in V_D$ , we feed them into the graph encoder to digest the structural information. We use relational graph convolutional networks (Schlichtkrull et al., 2018) to capture high-level hidden features considering different types of edge. The convolution computation for vertex  $v_i$  at the  $(l + 1)$ -th




Figure 4: Illustration of our DDA-GCN model. The utterance encoder encodes each utterance in a meeting into hidden vectors. The graph encoder performs convolutional computation over the discourse graph. The pointer decoder attends to the updated utterance representations and the word representations to generate the summary words either from the fixed-length vocabulary or copy from the input.

layer takes the representation  $h^{(l)}$  at the  $l$ -th layer as input can be defined as:

$$h_i^{(l+1)} = \text{ReLU} \left( \sum_{r \in R_D} \sum_{v_j \in \mathcal{N}_r(v_i)} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{N}_i^r|} W_r^{(l)} h_j^{(l)} \right) \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathcal{N}_r(v_i)$  denotes the set of neighbors of vertex  $v_i$  under relation  $r$  and  $W_r^{(l)}$  denotes relation-specific learnable parameters at the  $l$ -th layer.

However, uniformly accepting information from different discourse relations is not suitable for identifying important discourse. As shown in Figure 1, ‘‘Contrast’’ is more important than ‘‘Question-answer’’. Thus, we use the gate mechanism (Marcheggiani and Titov, 2017) to control the information passing:

$$g_j^{(l)} = \text{sigmoid} \left( W_{r,g}^{(l)} h_j^{(l)} \right) \quad (2)$$

where  $W_{r,g}^{(l)}$  denotes a learnable parameter under relation type  $r$  at the  $l$ -th layer. Equipped with the gate mechanism, the convolution computation can be defined as:

$$h_i^{(l+1)} = \text{ReLU} \left( \sum_{r \in R_D} \sum_{v_j \in \mathcal{N}_r(v_i)} g_j^{(l)} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{N}_i^r|} W_r^{(l)} h_j^{(l)} \right) \quad (3)$$

### 4.3 Pointer Decoder

We use a standard LSTM decoder with attention and copy mechanism to generate the summary

(Bahdanau et al., 2014; See et al., 2017). The global representation described in section 3.2 is used to initialize the decoder. At each step  $t$ , the decoder receives the word embedding of the previous word and has decoder state  $s_t$ . The attention distribution is calculated as in Luong et al. (2015). We consider both word-level attention and utterance-level attention. The word-level context vector  $h_t^{wl}$  is computed as:

$$\begin{aligned} e_{i,j}^t &= s_t^\top W_a h_{i,j}^0 \\ a^t &= \text{softmax}(e^t) \\ h_t^{wl} &= \sum_i \sum_j a_{i,j}^t h_{i,j}^0 \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where  $W_a$  is a learnable parameter and  $h_{i,j}^0$  is obtained from utterance encoder for  $u_{i,j}$ . The utterance-level context vector  $h_t^{ul}$  is calculated similarly to the word-level context vector, except that we use the final outputs of the graph encoder  $h_i^{(l)}$  which represent utterances to calculate the attention distribution. The final context vector is the concatenation of word-level and utterance-level context vector  $h_t^* = [h_t^{wl} || h_t^{ul}]$ , which is then used to calculate generation probability and the final probability distribution (See et al., 2017).

### 4.4 Training Objective

We use maximum likelihood training to train our model. Given the ground truth summary  $Y^* = [y_1^*, y_2^*, \dots, y_{|Y^*|}^*]$  for an input meeting  $U$ . We mini-




Figure 5: An instance of our pseudo-summarization data samples.

mize the negative log-likelihood of the target words sequence:

$$L = - \sum_{t=1}^{|Y^*|} \log p(y_t^* | y_1^* \dots y_{t-1}^*, U) \quad (5)$$

## 5 Pre-training

In this section, we introduce how to construct pseudo-summarization corpus based on the question-answer discourse relation, which can be used to pre-train our model.

Given a meeting and its corresponding discourse relations, we find a question often sparks a discussion. As shown in Figure 5, the user interface asked “What’s the standard colour?”, other participants start to discuss this small topic. Thus, we can view the discussion as a small meeting and the question as a pseudo summary of this small meeting. According to this observation, we collect pseudo-summarization data from the meeting summarization dataset where the question identified by dialogue discourse serves as the pseudo summary and  $N$  utterances (In experiments,  $N=10$ ) after the question serve as the pseudo input. In detail, there are some uninformative and normal questions such as “what is this here”, which are not suitable for pseudo-summarization corpus construction. Thus, we filter out questions that contain no noun and adjective to make the pseudo data cleaner.

Given this pseudo corpus, we first pre-train our model and then fine-tune it on the meeting summarization dataset. Our motivations are two-fold: (1) we can potentially augment the training data, (2) since the pseudo data is constructed from the meeting summarization dataset, the pre-training can give the model a warm start.

## 6 Experiments

**Dataset** We evaluate our model on the AMI Meeting Dataset (Carletta et al., 2005), in which the participants play different roles in a design team, including a project manager, a marketing expert, an industrial designer, and a user interface designer. They take a remote control design project from kick-off to completion. We preprocess and divide the dataset into training (97 meetings), development (20 meetings) and test (20 meetings) sets as done by (Shang et al., 2018). Since the current meeting summarization dataset has no dialogue discourse annotation, we get the dialogue discourse for one meeting based on Deep Sequential (Shi and Huang, 2019), a SOTA dialogue discourse parser trained on the STAC corpus (Asher et al., 2016).

**Implementation Details** For our model, the dimension of hidden states is set to 200 for encoder and decoder and both use 300-dimensional GloVe vectors (Pennington et al., 2014) which are updated during training. We train using Adam (Kingma and Ba, 2014) with the learning rate of 0.001 and using gradient clipping with a maximum gradient norm of 2. The vocabulary size is set to 5,806 and dropout rate is set to 0.5. In test process, beam size is set to 10. For pre-training, we stop training until the model converges on the pseudo data. For discourse parser training<sup>1</sup>, we use the default parameters except that vocabulary size is set to 2,000. **Evaluation Metrics** We adopt the standard metrics ROUGE (Lin, 2004) for evaluation and obtain the  $F_1$  scores for ROUGE-1, ROUGE-2, and ROUGE-L that measures the word-overlap, bigram-overlap and longest common sequence between the ground-truth and the generated summary respectively. The *pyrouge*<sup>2</sup> package is used to evaluate the performance of the model.

**Baseline Models** We compare our model with several baselines including extractive and abstractive methods. **TextRank** (Mihalcea and Tarau, 2004) is a graph-based extractive method that selects important sentences from the input document. **C&L** (Cheng and Lapata, 2016) is an extractive method based on sequence-to-sequence framework. Its decoder receives sentence embeddings and outputs sentence labels. **SummaRunner** (Nallapati et al., 2017) is an extractive method based on hierarchical RNN which iteratively constructs summary representation to predict sentence labels. **Cor-**

<sup>1</sup><https://github.com/shizhouxing/DialogueDiscourseParsing>

<sup>2</sup>[pypi.python.org/pypi/pyrouge/0.1.3](http://pypi.python.org/pypi/pyrouge/0.1.3)

**eRank** (Shang et al., 2018) is a unsupervised abstractive method which generates summaries by combining several approaches. **Pointer-Generator** (See et al., 2017) is an abstractive method equips with copy mechanism, its decoder can either generate from the vocabulary or copy from the input. **HRED** (Serban et al., 2016) is a hierarchical sequence-to-sequence model which is composed of a word-level LSTM and a sentence-level LSTM. **Sentence-Gated** (Goo and Chen, 2018) is an abstractive method that incorporates dialogue acts by the sentence-gated mechanism. **TopicSeg** (Li et al., 2019a) is an abstractive method using a hierarchical attention mechanism at three levels (topic, utterance, word).<sup>3</sup> **HMNet** (Zhu et al., 2020) is an abstractive method that incorporates part-of-speech and entity information, while pretraining on large-scale news summary data, then fine-tuning it on meeting datasets.

## 6.1 Automatic Evaluation

The DDA-GCN in Table 1 stands for the model that is based on the discourse graph and pre-trained using pseudo-summarization data. The DDA-GCN (w/o Pre-train) stands for the model that is directly trained using the meeting summarization dataset. The DDA-GCN (w/o Pre-train+DG) stands for the model that is based on the Levi graph and without pre-training. The DDA-GCN (Zero-shot) means directly testing the pre-trained model on the meeting summarization test set. We can see that our model DDA-GCN outperforms various baselines. Compared with DDA-GCN (w/o Pre-train+DG), our model DDA-GCN (w/o Pre-train) achieves better performance which indicates the effectiveness of taking the type of source and target vertices into account. By pre-training on pseudo-summarization data, our model DDA-GCN can further boost the performance by a large margin and achieves 1.69% improvement on ROUGE-1, 1.57% on ROUGE-2, 1.36% on ROUGE-L compared with DDA-GCN (w/o Pre-train+DG). Additionally, DDA-GCN (Zero-shot) still achieves a basic effect, which indicates the effectiveness of our pseudo data.

<sup>3</sup>(Li et al., 2019a) also proposed a model named TopicSeg+VFOA by incorporating vision features in a multi-modal setting. In this paper, we compare our model with baselines using only textual features.

Model	R-1	R-2	R-L
TextRank	35.19	6.13	15.70
SummaRunner	30.98	5.54	13.91
C&L	30.76	5.38	13.89
CoreRank	37.86	7.84	13.72
Seq2Seq+Attention	36.42	11.97	21.78
Pointer-Generator	42.60	14.01	22.62
HRED	49.75	18.36	23.90
Sentence-Gated	49.29	19.31	24.82
TopicSeg	51.53	12.23	25.47
HMNet	53.02	18.57	-
DDA-GCN(Zero-shot)	28.35	4.67	14.92
DDA-GCN	<b>53.15</b>	<b>22.32</b>	<b>25.67</b>
w/o Pre-train	51.42	20.99	24.89
w/o Pre-train+DG	51.46	20.75	24.31

Table 1: Test set results on the AMI Meeting Dataset using ROUGE  $F_1$ , where “R-1” is short for “ROUGE-1”, “R-2” for “ROUGE-2”, “R-L” for “ROUGE-L”. “DG” is short for “Discourse Graph”.

## 6.2 Human Evaluation

To further assess the quality of the generated summaries, we conduct a human evaluation study comparing summaries generated by our model and baselines. We choose three metrics: **fluency** (Flu: no grammatical problems), **relevance** (Rel: consistent with the original input), **informativeness** (Info: preserves the meaning expressed in the ground-truth). We hired six graduates who passed intermediate English test (CET-6) and are familiar with summarization tasks to perform the human evaluation. They were asked to rate each summary on a scale of 1 (worst) to 5 (best) for each metric. The results are shown in Table 2.

Model	Flu	Rel	Info
Ground-truth	4.94	4.94	4.78
SummaRunner	2.50	1.72	1.72
Pointer-Generator	3.50	3.22	2.50
Sentence-Gated	4.00	3.61	3.33
DDA-GCN	3.94	<b>3.78</b>	<b>3.50</b>
w/o Pre-train	<b>4.06</b>	<b>3.78</b>	3.11

Table 2: Human evaluation results.

Our model increases the performance on automatic evaluation metrics entails better human evaluation scores. we can see that our method

achieves higher scores in all three evaluation metrics compared with other baselines. We can see that DDA-GCN has a significant improvement in informativeness which indicates pre-training can help our model select more key information. However, DDA-GCN (w/o Pre-train) scored better than DDA-GCN on fluency. We argue that due to the difference between pseudo summary and the ground truth summary, pre-training may have some impact on the language model on the decoder side. Ground truth is still obtained significant high scores compare with model generated summaries indicating the challenge of this task.

### 6.3 Analysis: Effect of dialogue discourse

To verify the effectiveness of dialogue discourse, we randomly provide parts of the discourse relations to the model in the test process. The results are shown in Figure 6. We can see that the more dialogue discourse, the higher the ROUGE-L score, which indicates discourse can do good to summary generation. When given no discourse information, our model gets similar scores compared with HRED (Serban et al., 2016) which models utterances sequentially.




Figure 6: ROUGE-L score with respect to the percentage of dialogue discourse.

Furthermore, to verify the importance of each discourse relation type, we then test our model by giving different discourse relations. The results are shown in Figure 7. We can see that “Contrast” and “Acknowledgement” are more important than other discourse relations, we attribute this to the fact that these two relations strongly indicate the change of viewpoint which have influences on meeting information flow.

### 6.4 Analysis: Effect of pseudo-summarization data

To further study the effectiveness of pseudo-summarization data, instead of using questions




Figure 7: ROUGE-L score with respect to dialogue discourse relations.

Model	R-1	R-2	R-L
w/o Pre-train	51.42	20.99	24.89
Rule-based	52.94	21.96	25.05
Discourse-based	<b>53.15</b>	<b>22.32</b>	<b>25.67</b>

Table 3: The results of pre-training the DDA-GCN on different types of pseudo-summary data.

identified by dialogue discourse as pseudo summaries, we extract questions following two rules: (1) utterances which begin with WH-words, such as “what”, “who” and “why”, (2) utterances which end with a question mark. We call the pseudo data discourse-based and rule-based according to the way the question was obtained. We first pre-train our model on the two types of pseudo data separately and then fine-tune it on the AMI dataset. The results are shown in Table 3. We can see that pre-training on discourse-based data is better than rule-based data, demonstrating the effectiveness of dialogue discourse. Besides, pre-training on rule-based data still achieves a good result, which indicates the rationality of our pre-training strategy.

### 6.5 Analysis: Case study

Table 4 shows an example summary generated by different models and the visualization of utterance attention weights when generating this summary. The darker the color, the higher the weight. Sentence-Gated (Goo and Chen, 2018) focuses more on the second utterance than the third utterance (shown in Table 4(b)). The second one mainly talks about “fruit shape” which leads to the omission of the keyword “vegetable”. Differently, we can observe that our model pays more attention to the first and third utterances which form a

(a)		<p>Marketing Expert : The fashion trends are that people want sort of clothes and shoes and things with <b>fruit</b> and <b>vegetables</b> theme .</p> <p>User Interface : If you start making the buttons <b>fruit</b> shaped, it might make it more complicated to use .</p> <p>Project Manager : <b>Fruit</b> and <b>vegetables</b> may be popular at the moment but as we know how fickle the fashion markets are.</p> <p>Project Manager : It just seems realistic that the remote control market isn't the thing which takes in those kinds of fashion trends .</p>	<p>Inform</p> <p>Access</p> <p>Inform</p> <p>Inform</p>	(b)
Ground-truth	The Marketing Expert presented trends in the remote control market and the <b>fruit</b> and <b>vegetable</b> and spongy material trends in fashion.			
Pointer-Generator	They discussed the possibility of a <b>fruit or fruit and fruit</b> .			
Sentence-Gated	The need to incorporate a <b>fruit</b> theme into the design of the remote.			
DDA-GCN	The buttons will be included in a <b>fruit</b> and <b>vegetable</b> theme into the shape of the remote control.			

Table 4: Example summaries generated by different models and utterance attention weights visualization of (a) DDA-GCN and (b) Sentence-Gated.

“Contrast” discourse structure (shown in Table 4(a)). They both mention “fruit” and “vegetables” which help our model generate the correct summary that contains both keywords.

## 7 Related Work

**Meeting Summarization** Previous works focused on extractive meeting summarization (Xie et al., 2008). A recent study shows that for meeting summarization, people prefer abstract summaries to extracted ones (Murray et al., 2010). Shang et al. (2018) proposed a unified framework for fully unsupervised abstractive meeting summarization. Goo and Chen (2018) incorporated dialogue acts which indicate the effect of utterances. Ganesh and Dingliwal (2019) used CRF to tag each utterance a discourse label and then remove utterances that do not contribute to the meeting based on rules. Liu et al. (2019b) incorporated topic information which serves as a coarse-grained structure of the meeting. Li et al. (2019a) proposed a hierarchical model under the multi-modal setting by incorporating vision features. Liu et al. (2019a) generated a summary in a two-stage manner by first producing a sequence of keywords and then a full summary. Zhu et al. (2020) made use of large-scale news datasets to first pretrain the model and then fine-tune it on meeting dataset. Koay et al. (2020) revealed domain terminology has a substantial impact on meeting summarization performance. In this paper, we first propose to transform the utterances of a meeting into a graph via dialogue discourse.

**Graph-to-Sequence Generation** Recent research efforts for text generation consider utilizing Graph Neural Networks (GNN) to better model structured data, such as AMR (Beck et al., 2018; Ribeiro et al., 2019), SQL (Xu et al., 2018), and knowledge graph (Koncel-Kedziorski et al., 2019). Additionally, there are many works employed GNN in non-structural scenarios, such as summarization (Yasunaga et al., 2017; Fernandes et al., 2018; Antognini and Faltings, 2019) and comment generation (Li et al., 2019b), by transforming the input into a meaningful graph. We propose the discourse graph to facilitate information flow over the graph.

## 8 Conclusions

In this paper, we apply the dialogue discourse to model the structure of a meeting for meeting summarization. We first transform the entire meeting text and corresponding dialogue discourse relations into a discourse graph. Specifically, both the utterances and discourse relations are constructed as vertices, and we design six types of edge and a global vertex to facilitate the information flow. Moreover, we develop a Dialogue Discourse-Aware Graph Convolutional Networks (DDA-GCN) which consists of an utterance encoder, a graph encoder, and a pointer decoder. In addition, we construct a pseudo-summarization corpus by utilizing the question-answer discourse relation, which can be used to pretrain our model. Experiments on the AMI dataset show the effectiveness of our model which can achieve the SOTA performance.

## References

- Diego Antognini and Boi Faltings. 2019. [Learning to create sentence semantic relation graphs for multi-document summarization](#). In *Proceedings of the 2nd Workshop on New Frontiers in Summarization*, pages 32–41, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Nicholas Asher, Julie Hunter, Mathieu Morey, Farah Benamara, and Stergos Afantenos. 2016. Discourse structure and dialogue acts in multiparty dialogue: The stac corpus.
- Dzmitry Bahdanau, Kyunghyun Cho, and Yoshua Bengio. 2014. Neural machine translation by jointly learning to align and translate. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1409.0473*.
- Daniel Beck, Gholamreza Haffari, and Trevor Cohn. 2018. [Graph-to-sequence learning using gated graph neural networks](#). In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 273–283, Melbourne, Australia. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jean Carletta, Simone Ashby, Sebastien Bourban, Mike Flynn, Mael Guillemot, Thomas Hain, Jaroslav Kadlec, Vasilis Karaiskos, Wessel Kraaij, Melissa Kronenthal, et al. 2005. The ami meeting corpus: A pre-announcement. In *International workshop on machine learning for multimodal interaction*, pages 28–39. Springer.
- Jianpeng Cheng and Mirella Lapata. 2016. [Neural summarization by extracting sentences and words](#). In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 484–494, Berlin, Germany. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Patrick Fernandes, Miltiadis Allamanis, and Marc Brockschmidt. 2018. Structured neural summarization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.01824*.
- Prakhar Ganesh and Saket Dingliwal. 2019. [Abstractive summarization of spoken and written conversation](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.01615*.
- Chih-Wen Goo and Yun-Nung Chen. 2018. [Abstractive dialogue summarization with sentence-gated modeling optimized by dialogue acts](#). In *2018 IEEE Spoken Language Technology Workshop (SLT)*, pages 735–742. IEEE.
- Jonathan L Gross, Jay Yellen, and Ping Zhang. 2013. *Handbook of graph theory*. Chapman and Hall/CRC.
- Diederik P Kingma and Jimmy Ba. 2014. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980*.
- Jia Jin Koay, Alexander Roustai, Xiaojin Dai, Dillon Burns, Alec Kerrigan, and Fei Liu. 2020. [How domain terminology affects meeting summarization performance](#). In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 5689–5695, Barcelona, Spain (Online). International Committee on Computational Linguistics.
- Rik Koncel-Kedziorski, Dhanush Bekal, Yi Luan, Mirella Lapata, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2019. [Text Generation from Knowledge Graphs with Graph Transformers](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 2284–2293, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Julian Kupiec, Jan Pedersen, and Francine Chen. 1999. A trainable document summarizer. *Advances in Automatic Summarization*, pages 55–60.
- Friedrich Wilhelm Levi. 1942. *Finite geometrical systems: six public lectures delivered in February, 1940, at the University of Calcutta*. The University of Calcutta.
- Manling Li, Lingyu Zhang, Heng Ji, and Richard J. Radke. 2019a. [Keep meeting summaries on topic: Abstractive multi-modal meeting summarization](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 2190–2196, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Wei Li, Jingjing Xu, Yancheng He, ShengLi Yan, Yunfang Wu, and Xu Sun. 2019b. [Coherent comments generation for Chinese articles with a graph-to-sequence model](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 4843–4852, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Chin-Yew Lin. 2004. ROUGE: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries. In *Text Summarization Branches Out*, pages 74–81, Barcelona, Spain. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Chunyi Liu, Peng Wang, Jiang Xu, Zang Li, and Jieping Ye. 2019a. Automatic dialogue summary generation for customer service. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, pages 1957–1965. ACM.
- Zhengyuan Liu, Angela Ng, Sheldon Lee, Ai Ti Aw, and Nancy F Chen. 2019b. [Topic-aware pointer-generator networks for summarizing spoken conversations](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.01335*.
- Minh-Thang Luong, Hieu Pham, and Christopher D Manning. 2015. Effective approaches to attention-based neural machine translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1508.04025*.
- William C Mann and Sandra A Thompson. 1988. Rhetorical structure theory: Toward a functional theory of text organization. *Text-interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Discourse*, 8(3):243–281.

- Diego Marcheggiani and Ivan Titov. 2017. Encoding sentences with graph convolutional networks for semantic role labeling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1703.04826*.
- Rada Mihalcea and Paul Tarau. 2004. **TextRank: Bringing order into text**. In *Proceedings of the 2004 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 404–411, Barcelona, Spain. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Gabriel Murray, Giuseppe Carenini, and Raymond Ng. 2010. Generating and validating abstracts of meeting conversations: a user study. In *Proceedings of the 6th International Natural Language Generation Conference*, pages 105–113. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ramesh Nallapati, Feifei Zhai, and Bowen Zhou. 2017. **Summarunner: A recurrent neural network based sequence model for extractive summarization of documents**.
- Chris D Paice. 1990. Constructing literature abstracts by computer: techniques and prospects. *Information Processing & Management*, 26(1):171–186.
- Jeffrey Pennington, Richard Socher, and Christopher Manning. 2014. **Glove: Global vectors for word representation**. In *Proceedings of the 2014 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 1532–1543, Doha, Qatar. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Leonardo F. R. Ribeiro, Claire Gardent, and Iryna Gurevych. 2019. **Enhancing AMR-to-text generation with dual graph representations**. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 3181–3192, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Michael Schlichtkrull, Thomas N Kipf, Peter Bloem, Rianne Van Den Berg, Ivan Titov, and Max Welling. 2018. Modeling relational data with graph convolutional networks. In *European Semantic Web Conference*, pages 593–607. Springer.
- Abigail See, Peter J. Liu, and Christopher D. Manning. 2017. **Get to the point: Summarization with pointer-generator networks**. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1073–1083, Vancouver, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Iulian V Serban, Alessandro Sordani, Yoshua Bengio, Aaron Courville, and Joelle Pineau. 2016. Building end-to-end dialogue systems using generative hierarchical neural network models. In *Thirtieth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- Guokan Shang, Wensi Ding, Zekun Zhang, Antoine Tixier, Polykarpos Meladianos, Michalis Vazirgiannis, and Jean-Pierre Lorré. 2018. **Unsupervised abstractive meeting summarization with multi-sentence compression and budgeted submodular maximization**. In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 664–674, Melbourne, Australia. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zhouxing Shi and Minlie Huang. 2019. A deep sequential model for discourse parsing on multi-party dialogues. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 33, pages 7007–7014.
- Shasha Xie, Yang Liu, and Hui Lin. 2008. Evaluating the effectiveness of features and sampling in extractive meeting summarization. In *2008 IEEE Spoken Language Technology Workshop*, pages 157–160. IEEE.
- Kun Xu, Lingfei Wu, Zhiguo Wang, Yansong Feng, and Vadim Sheinin. 2018. **SQL-to-text generation with graph-to-sequence model**. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 931–936, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Michihiro Yasunaga, Rui Zhang, Kshitijh Meelu, Ayush Pareek, Krishnan Srinivasan, and Dragomir Radev. 2017. **Graph-based neural multi-document summarization**. In *Proceedings of the 21st Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning (CoNLL 2017)*, pages 452–462, Vancouver, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Chenguang Zhu, Ruochen Xu, Michael Zeng, and Xuedong Huang. 2020. A hierarchical network for abstractive meeting summarization with cross-domain pretraining. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: Findings*, pages 194–203.